

EXTENSION FEES

Attach application extension fees for response within second month US\$225.00.

REMARK

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated Jan 11, 2005.

Moreover, the Examiner has rejected Claim 1 to 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamada(US 2003016720) in view of Lin et al (US 20040070333) in further view of West (US 2528849) and in further view of Dorsey (US 2825040). However, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdraw in light of the following comments.

Kazuhiro, Kamada, the first reference cited by the Examiner, it refers to semiconductor equipment. The manufacturing method for this equipment in this case is different from a combination architecture with a stem, while the brace-end of the stem is connected to a supportive chip cup disk where the other molybdenum wire is bended by 180° and a setup of a sharp body tapering at its rear end pushes the chip. For this reason, this manufacturing method and equipment are significantly distinct from the invention in this case. Hence, this reference can be clearly distinguished from the present invention.

Noting the deficiencies in the disclosures of Kazuhiro, Kamada, the

Examiner has to bridge the gap. For the following reasons, applicant does not believe that Lin et al, West, Baker and Dorsey cure the deficiencies in the disclosures of Kazuhiro, Kamada.

Ming-Der Lin et al, the second reference cited by the Examiner, it refers to the equipment for displaying saturated hue. The equipment consists of multiple pixels; each pixel unit, featuring lucent conductivity based on multiple sets of emission lamps and electrodes, is made of different plates, chips, holders, and molybdenum wires and involves a wick cylinder and an open, plate-like, arc ring as well as a molybdenum wire tapering at its rear end bended by 180° to push the chip. Thus, this reference is in no way similar to the present invention.

West, Dorsey, reference cited by the Examiner, both of these two cases relate to equipment such as electronic emitters. In the West case, the high-electrode equipment is a kind of high-frequency-emitter appliance while in the case upon Baker is also an electronic emitter appliance in relation with electrode. From relevant drawings and components, we learn that there are no similar techniques forming stem into a sustainable plate and a molybdenum wire bended by 180° .

Dorsey, reference cited by the Examiner, although both devices act as decorated illumination bulbs; as we look into this bulb, it is actually composed of two lead filaments. As shown in the second drawing, the cross section is partially disconnected, is a unique stem-based architecture and there is no characteristic evidence showing that the holder sustains a plate and the molybdenum wire bended by 180° .

Consequently, this reference is completely different from the Dorsey

reference at all.

Accordingly, even if one is to combine the disclosures of Kazuhiro, Kamada, Lin et al, West, Baker and Dorsey, such combined disclosures still fails to teach the presently claimed invention.

The applicant has reviewed the prior art as cited by the Examiner but not used in the rejection and believes that the present invention clearly and distinctly patentable defines over such prior art.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectively requested.

Respectfully submitted.

LEE HAN MING

LEE, HAN-MING

Dated: Jun/02/2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY